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Machine Learning/AI is becoming a backbone of commerce, science, and society.

The fog of war: What is new and what is important?
Supervised ML

Input: data \((x_i, y_i), i = 1..n, x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \{-1, 1\}\)

ML algorithm \(f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\), that “works” on new data.

Goal: find \(f^*\) with smallest possible loss on the unseen data:

\[
f^* = \arg\min_{f} E_{\text{unseen data}} L(f(x), y)
\]

Statistical setting: True/expected risk
(Algorithmic) Empirical risk minimization (ERM) -- basis for nearly all algorithms:

\[ f^* = \text{arg min}_{f_w \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\text{training data}} L(f_w(x_i), y_i) \]

Typically SGD over \( w \).
Classical U-shaped generalization curve

However, a model with zero training error is overfit to the training data and will typically generalize poorly.
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Generalization bounds

Basic (WYSIYG) bounds:
VC-dim, fat shattering, Rademacher, covering numbers, margin...

\[ E(L(f^*, y)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum L(f^*(x_i), y_i) + O^*(\sqrt{\frac{c}{n}}) \]

Expected risk: what you get
Empirical risk: what you see

Empirical risk approximates expected risk for large \( n \).

Model or function complexity, e.g., VC or \( \|f\|_\mathcal{H} \)
Does interpolation overfit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>model</th>
<th># params</th>
<th>random crop</th>
<th>weight decay</th>
<th>train accuracy</th>
<th>test accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>1,649,402</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[CIAR 10, from Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization, Zhang, et al., 2017]

But maybe test accuracy should be 100%
Interpolation does not overfit even for very noisy data

All methods (except Bayes optimal) have zero training square loss.

[B., Ma, Mandal, ICML 18]
Best practice for deep learning from Ruslan Salakhutdinov’s tutorial on deep learning (Simons Institute, Berkeley, 2017):

The best way to solve the problem from practical standpoint is you build a very big system... basically you want to make sure you hit the zero training error.
Yann Lecun (IPAM talk, 2018):

*Deep learning breaks some basic rules of statistics.*

It is time to resolve this issue!
This talk

- Statistical theory of interpolation.
  - Why (WYSIWYG) bounds do not apply + what analyses do apply.
  - Statistical validity of interpolation.

- The generalization landscape of Machine Learning.
  - Double Descent: reconciling interpolation and the classical U curve.
  - Occam’s razor: more features is better.

- Interpolation and optimization
  - Easy optimization + fast SGD (+ good generalization).
Basic bounds:
VC-dim, fat shattering, Rademacher, covering numbers, margin...

Expected risk

\[ E(L(f^*, y)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum L(f^*(x_i), y_i) + O^* \left( \sqrt{\frac{c}{n}} \right) \]

Empirical risk

Interpolation

Can such bounds explain generalization?
What kind of generalization bound could work here? (Hopefully correct but nontrivial)

$$0.7 < O^* \left( \frac{\sqrt{c(n)}}{n} \right) < 0.9$$
Not a question of improving bounds

\[ 0.7 < O^* \left( \sqrt{\frac{c(n)}{n}} \right) < 0.9 \quad n \to \infty \]

There are no bounds like this and no reason they should exist.

A constant factor of 2 invalidates the bound!
Generalization theory for interpolation?

What theoretical analyses do we have?

- VC-dimension/Rademacher complexity/covering/margin bounds.
  - Cannot deal with interpolated classifiers when Bayes risk is non-zero.
  - Generalization gap cannot be bound when empirical risk is zero.

- Regularization-type analyses (Tikhonov, early stopping/SGD, etc.)
  - Diverge as $\lambda \to 0$ for fixed $n$.

- Algorithmic stability.
  - Does not apply when empirical risk is zero, expected risk nonzero.

- Classical smoothing methods (i.e., Nadaraya–Watson).
  - Most classical analyses do not support interpolation.
  - But 1-NN! (Also Hilbert regression Scheme, [Devroye, et al. 98])
A way forward?

1-nearest neighbor classifier is very suggestive.

Interpolating classifier with a non-trivial (sharp!) performance guarantee.

Twice the Bayes risk [Cover, Hart, 67].

- Analysis not based on complexity bounds.
- Estimating expected loss, not the generalization gap.
Simplicial interpolation

1. Triangulate.
2. Linearly interpolate.
3. Threshold.

[B., Hsu, Mitra, NeurIPS 18]
Nearly optimality of SI

**Theorem** (dimension $d$) (additional cond. to get exp).

$$E(L(SI)) - \text{Bayes Risk} < \frac{1}{2^d} \times \text{Bayes Risk}$$

Cf. classical bound for 1-NN:

$$E(L(1_{NN})) - \text{Bayes Risk} < \text{Bayes Risk}$$

The blessing of dimensionality.

[B., Hsu, Mitra, NeuriPS 18]
Interpolated k-NN schemes

\[ f(x) = \frac{\sum y_i k(x_i, x)}{\sum k(x_i, x)} \]

\[ k(x_i, x) = \frac{1}{||x - x_i||^\alpha}, \quad k(x_i, x) = -\log ||x - x_i|| \]

(cf. Shepard's interpolation)

Theorem

Weighted (interpolated) k-nn schemes with certain singular kernels are consistent (converge to Bayes optimal) for classification in any dimension.

Moreover, statistically (minimax) optimal for regression in any dimension.

[B., Hsu, Mitra, NeurIPS 18] [B., Rakhlin, Tsybakov, AIStats 19]
Theorem: adversarial examples for interpolated classifiers are asymptotically dense (assuming the labels are not deterministic).

[B., Hsu, Mitra, NeurIPS 18]
This talk

- **Statistical theory of interpolation.**
  - Why (WYSIWYG) bounds do not apply + what analyses do apply.
  - Statistical validity of interpolation.

- **The generalization landscape of Machine Learning.**
  - Double Descent: reconciling interpolation and the classical U curve.
  - Occam's razor: more features is better.

- **Interpolation and optimization**
  - Easy optimization + fast SGD (+ good generalization).
"Double descent" risk curve

Classical risk curve

[ B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, 18]
Empirical evidence

- Random ReLU network
- Fully connected network
- Random Forest
- L2-boost

**TIMIT, Zero-one loss**

- RFF network

**1D simulated data**

- Mean squared error vs. number of parameters
  - SNR = ∞
  - SNR = 20

[ B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, 18]
More evidence: neural networks

Advani, Saxe, 2017

Spigler, et al, 2018
Theory of double descent: RFF networks

Data \((x_i, y_i), i = 1..n, x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \{-1,1\}\)

Feature map \(\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N\), \(w_j\) sampled iid from normal distribution in \(\mathbb{R}^d\).

\[
\phi(x) = (e^{i\pi\langle w_1, x \rangle}, ..., e^{i\pi\langle w_N, x \rangle})
\]

Random Fourier Features (RFF) [Rahimi, Recht, NIPS 2007]
Followed by linear regression.

\[
h_{n,N}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j e^{i\pi\langle w_j, x \rangle}
\]

Neural network with one hidden layer, \(\cos\) non-linearity, fixed first layer weights. Hidden layer of size \(N\).
What is the mechanism?

\[ N \to \infty \quad \text{--- infinite width neural net.} \]

(Data size \( n \) is constant!)

Infinite net = kernel machine!

\[ h_{n,\infty} = \text{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}, h(x_i) = y_i} \| h \|_{\mathcal{H}} \]

More features \Rightarrow better approximation to minimum norm solution
Is infinite width optimal?

Infinite net (kernel machine) $h_{n,\infty}$ is near-optimal empirically.

Suppose $\forall i \ y_i = h^*(x_i)$ for some $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$ (Gaussian RKHS).

Theorem (noiseless case):

$$|h^*(x) - h_{n,\infty}(x)| = Ae^{-B(n/\log n)^{1/d}} \|h^*\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

Compare to $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ for classical bias-variance analyses.

[B., Hsu, Ma, Mandal, 18]
More (ReLU) features - more smoothness
Smoothness by averaging

An average of interpolating trees is better than any individual tree.

Cf. PERT [Cutler, Zhao 01]
Double Descent in Linear Regression

Choosing maximum number of features is optimal under the "weak random feature" model.

[B., Hsu, Xu, 19].

Related work: [Hastie, Montanari, Rosset, Tibshirani 19] [Bartlett, Long, Lugosi, Tsigler 19]
Occam’s razor based on inductive bias: Choose the smoothest function subject to interpolating the data.

Three ways to increase smoothness:

- **Explicit**: minimum functional norms solutions
  - Exact: kernel machines.
  - Approximate: RFF, ReLU features.
- **Implicit**: SGD/optimization (Neural networks)
- **Averaging**: (Bagging, L2-boost).

All coincide for kernel machines.

Here be dragons.
This talk

- **Statistical theory of interpolation.**
  - Why (WWSI WYG) bounds do not apply + what analyses do apply.
  - Statistical validity of interpolation.

- **The generalization landscape of Machine Learning.**
  - Double Descent: reconciling interpolation and the classical U curve.
  - Occam's razor: more features is better.

- **Interpolation and optimization**
  - Easy optimization + fast SGD (+ good generalization).
Optimization under interpolation

Classical (under-parametrized):

- Many local minima.
- SGD (fixed step size) does not converge.

Modern (interpolation):

- Every local minimum is global.

A lot of recent work. [Kawaguchi, 16] [Soheil, et al, 16] [Bartlett, et al, 17] [Soltanolkotabi, et al, 17, 18] [Du, et al, 19] ...

- Small batch SGD (fixed step size) converges as fast as GD. [Ma, Bassily, B., ICML 18]
Why SGD?

$$w^* = \arg \min_w L(w) = \arg \min_w \frac{1}{n} \sum L_i(w)$$

**SGD Idea:** optimize $\sum L_i(w)$, $m$ at a time.

Error after $t$ steps

**GD:** $e^{-t}$
**SGD:** $1/t$

**All major neural network optimization use SGD.**

**SGD is not simply noisy GD.**
**Key Observation:**

Interpolation

\[ f_{w^*}(x_i) = y_i \Rightarrow \forall_i L_i(w^*) = 0 \]

implies exponential convergence

w. fixed step size
Exponential convergence of m-SGD

Convex loss function $L$ ($\lambda$-smooth, $\alpha$-strongly convex), $L_i(\beta$-smooth).

**Theorem** [exponential convergence of $m$-SGD in interpolation regime]

\[
E L(w_{t+1}) \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} (1 - \eta^*(m)\alpha)^t ||w_1 - w^*||
\]

\[
\eta^*(m) = \frac{m}{\beta + \lambda(m-1)}
\]

[Ma, Bassily, B., ICML 18]

Related work ($m=1$): [Strohmer, Vershynin 09] [Moulines, Bach, 11] [Schmidt, Le Roux, 13] [Needell, Srebro, Ward 14]
SGD is (much) faster than GD

Real data example.

One step of SGD with mini-batch $m^* \approx 8$

= 

One step of GD.

[Ma, Bassily, B., ICML 18]
The power of interpolation

Optimization in modern deep learning:

overparametrization
interpolation
fast SGD
GPU

SGD $O\left(\frac{n}{m^*}\right)$ computational gain over GD
* GPU implementation $\sim 100$ over CPU.

$n = 10^6, m^* = 8$: SGD on GPU $\sim 10^7$ x faster than GD on CPU!
Learning from deep learning: fast and effective kernel machines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Our method (GPU)</th>
<th>ThunderSVM (GPU) [WSL+18]</th>
<th>LibSVM (CPU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMIT</td>
<td>$1 \cdot 10^5$</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>15 s</td>
<td>480 s</td>
<td>1.6 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>$7 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>13 s</td>
<td>142 s</td>
<td>3.8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>$6 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>6 s</td>
<td>31 s</td>
<td>9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>$5 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>8 s</td>
<td>121 s</td>
<td>3.4 h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smaller datasets take seconds.
No optimization parameters to select.

Code: https://github.com/EigenPro

[Ma, B., NIPS 17, SysML 19]
Important points

- New phenomenon is interpolation, not over-parametrization.
  - Classical methods, like kernels machines/splines are infinitely over-parametrized. Over-parametrization enables interpolation but is not sufficient.

- Empirical loss is a useful optimization target, not a meaningful statistic for the expected loss.

- Optimization is qualitatively different under interpolation.
  - Every local minimum is global.
  - SGD is overwhelmingly faster than GD.
  - Many phenomena can be understood from linear regression.
From classical statistics to modern ML

Classical.
- Classical bounds apply.
- Many local minima.
- SGD converges slowly.
- Classical model.
  Careful parameter selection required.

Modern ML (interpolation regime).
- Generalization based on functional smoothness.
- Optimization is “easy”: every local minimum is global.
- SGD converges faster than GD.
- A “modern” model: good generalization + easy/efficient optimization.
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